

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 16, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1-8, 10-13 and 15-17 were pending, allowed claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 and rejected claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 17. No claims have been amended, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 17 are pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

An interview was conducted with the Examiner and the substance of the Interview is discussed below.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Weinberg in view of Nelson.

As discussed with the Examiner, Nelson is about stub invocation where a stub substitutes for a thread that will not release (see col. 3, lines 54-67)

As also discussed with the Examiner, the test tool of Weinberg (see fig. 6c) allows a user to create transactions that are used to test a transaction server. The test tool user essentially creates the transactions (submissions), the tool sends the transactions to the server, the server responds, the tool receives the server response, the tool displays the result and the user reviews the results (pages returned by the server) - see col. 2, lines 26-30. A transaction can be a request to the server for information, such as a departure time for an air plane flight (see col. 2, lines 60-64) or orders for materials in an inventory (see fig. 3C). Interactions between a web browser (being emulated) and a web server are recorded by the tool. The test tool essentially emulates a user using a client program (such as a web browser) to test the server.

In contrast, claim 1 is about emulating a server to test a program ("emulating the receiving portion of a server by parsing an electronic text transmitted from a program to be tested to detect a required data item").

In summary, Weinberg emulates a client in contrast to claim 1 which calls for emulating a server. The opposite things are being emulated.

The above discussion about claim 1 can be used to inform the review of claims 2-8, 10, 11 and 17.

As noted in the Interview Summary, the Examiner agreed to withdraw the finality.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 14, 2007

By:   
J. Randall Beckers 30, 358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501